owned or controlled in any manner by any other undertaking which not so exempted from provisions of Drugs (Prices Control) Order, 1987;

(ii) the formulations are marketed by the concerned unit/company in their own brand names and not in the brand names of and/or trade marks belonging to any other company.

(c) Since small scale sector units are exempt from price control in respect of Category II formulations, their prices are generally higher than the prices fixed by the Government in respect of organised sector units.

(d) To the extent information is available, the products involved in such cases are as under:—

(a) Combiflam Tablets
(b) Magadol Tablets
(c) Proxyvon range of formulations.
(d) Flagyl Injection
(e) Anaflam Tablets
(f) Alcovt H-Skin Ointment.

Assessment of liabilities of drug companies and their products

732. SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state.

(a) what are the names of the companies and the products in respect of which liabilities under DPCO, 1979 remain to be assessed so far;

(b) what are the names of the companies and the products in respect of which liabilities on account of overcharging under DPCO, 1987 remains to be assessed;

(c) whether it is a fact that liabilities in these cases have not been assessed due to the proximity of some bureaucrates to these companies; and

(d) if so, what steps have been taken against them?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) and (b) Assessment of the tentative liabilities of the companies on account of violation of the various provisions of the DPCOs and/or in terms of the judgements of the Courts has already been completed in a number of cases, while in respect of the remaining cases efforts are being made to complete the same as quickly as possible. In a number of cases, the progress has been hampered on account of non-receipt of complete data for the entire relevant period. The updated information has already been furnished alongwith Rajya Sabha Starred Question No. 126 dated 16th July, 1992. The companies have been informed that in case they do not supply the data the Government will be left with no alternative but to compute their liabilities on the basis of whatever data becomes available from wherever. The question of any company being let off does not arise.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise.

Reduction of Custom Duty on Ceftaxidine

733. SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN: SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Starred Question 68 given in the Rajya Sabha on 30th April, 1992 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that custom duty on Ceftaxidime was reduced in July, 1991;

(b) what was the earlier price and revised price and what was the extent of reduction in price;

(c) when was the benefit of custom duty reduction on the bulk drug passed on to consumers by reducing the prices of the formulations;

(d) whether it is a fact that the benefit of reduction of custom duty retained by the producers; and

(e) if so, who is responsible for such a state of affairs and what steps have been taken to fix responsibility?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) The Hon'ble Members are perhaps referring to the drug 'Ceftazidime'. The custom duty on this drug was reduced in July, 1991, however, the actual import at 0 per cent duty took place only in November, 1991 after necessary amendment in the notification.

(b) and (c) Before July, 1991 the Ceftazidime Injection in the finished form was being imported at 0 per cent custom duty and only after withdrawing custom duty on bulk drug Ceftazimidime, the manufacture of Ceftazidime Injection has been started in the country. To the extent information is available, the prices of formulations based on bulk drug Ceftazidime before and after Custom duty concession are as follows :

Name of the Formulations	Earlier Price (w.e.f. March, 91)	Revised Price (w.e.f. Dec., 91)
1. Fortum Inj. 250mg.	66.21	97.69
2. Fortum Inj. 500mg.	131.93	165.61
3. Fortum Inj. 1gm.	262.83	300.38

(d) and (e) This drug is out of price control. Before custom duty reduction, the company was selling finished imported formulations and after custom duty reduction the company selling indigenously manufactured formulations based on imported bulk drug. To check whether the benefit of custom duty has been passed on to the consumer, the data has been called for from the company.

Date of filing writ petition for Flucort range of formulations

734. SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU:
SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1143 given in Rajya Sabha on the 7th May, 1992 and state:

(a) when was the writ petition for Flucort range of formulation filed in the Bombay High Court;

(b) when were the parawise comments sent and when were the counter affidavit filed in Bombay High Court;

(c) what is the present position of the case and who is responsible for the delay;

(d) what steps are being taken to expedite the decision;

(e) whether it is a fact that company never implemented the prices; and

(f) so, when were the prices implemented and what was the method adopted for verifying the same?